

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

010/016

OCT 30 2006

PATENT

App. Ser. No.: 10/600,021

Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920030230US1

PS Ref. No.: IBMK30230

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated August 29, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 29, 2006. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-37 are pending in the application. Claims 16-17 and 28-29 have been canceled. Claims 1-15, 18-27 and 30-37 remain pending following entry of this response. Claim 15 has been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Double Patenting

Claims 1, 2, 15, 25, 30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 12, 18, 21 of co-pending Application No. 10/600,014 in view of US patent No. 6,956,593 to Gupta et al (hereinafter *Gupta*).

Applicants have filed a terminal disclaimer to address the Examiner's double patenting rejection. Therefore, Applicants request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-26, 30-37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent No 6,956,593 to *Gupta et al.* (hereinafter, "*Gupta*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as

Page 9

611738_1.DOC

PATENT
App. Ser. No.: 10/600,021
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920030230US1
PS Ref. No.: IBMK30230

is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

With respect to claim 15, Applicants submit that *Gupta* does not teach retrieving one or more annotation structures associated with a data object and dependent, at least in part, on at least one credential of a user initiating the request, *wherein the at least one credential comprises a role of the user* and "generating a graphical user interface based on one of the annotation structures."

The Examiner argues that *Gupta* teaches retrieving one or more annotation structures dependent on a role of the user Column 17, Lines: 31-36, which states:

In dialog box 420, a level of detail 422 to retrieve can be selected by the user. Different levels can be selected from a drop-down or pull-down menu by selecting icon 424. Examples of different levels that could be retrieved include the "full level" (that is, all content of the annotation), a "summary only" level, a "user identifier only" level, a "preview" level including only the first 512 bytes of data, etc.

However, Applicants submit, the cited section describes the amount of content of an annotation which may be displayed to a user after a query is executed. Nowhere in the cited section or any other portion of *Gupta* is *retrieving one or more annotation structures associated with a data object and dependent on at least one credential of a user* described. In fact, nowhere in *Gupta* is there any description of associating different annotation structures with different data objects at all.

As claimed and described in the present application, by associating different annotation structures with different data objects and different user roles, different interfaces (e.g., GUIs) may be generated. These different type GUIs allow the specific annotation content captured to be tailored to a particular application, as described in Paragraph [0112].

PATENT
App. Ser. No.: 10/600,021
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920030230US1
PS Ref. No.: IBMK30230

For example, Figure 8B of the present application illustrates a default form 810B (based on a default annotation structure) which may be presented to a default user in order for the default user to create an annotation for a data object (e.g., a patent application). Figure 8C illustrates a different form, an inventor feedback form 810C (based on an inventor feedback annotation structure), which may be displayed to a different user (an inventor) in order for the different user to create an annotation for the same data object (i.e., the patent application). Thus, a set of annotation structures (e.g., the default annotation structure and the inventor feedback annotation structure) may be used to present differing interfaces (default form 810B or inventor feedback form 810C) to different users of an annotation system.

Therefore, claim 15 and its dependents are believed to be allowable, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 1, 25, and 30, as stated above, Applicants submit that *Gupta does not teach associating different annotation structures with different data objects*, as recited in these claims. The Examiner cites multiple sections of *Gupta* as teaching a set of annotation structures, including: Column 2, Lines 40-47; Figure 4; Column 2, Lines 66-67; Column 7, Lines: 28-39; and Column 10, Lines 4-6. However, cited sections only teach that annotations may belong to sets, but there is no mention that *different annotation structures are associated with different annotatable data objects*, as recited in the claims.

As described with reference to FIG. 6A of the present application and the corresponding description, by associating different annotation structures with different data objects, different interfaces (e.g., GUIs) may be created to capture different types of annotation information for different types of objects. In the illustrated method (at step 502), a request to generate an annotation for a *specified data object* is received and (at step 504) an annotation structure 149 may be retrieved *based on the data object to be annotated*. (At step 506) a GUI is generated based on the annotation structure. In this manner, an annotation structure may be used to generate a form (e.g., a GUI) for a user

PATENT
App. Ser. No.: 10/600,021
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920030230US1
PS Ref. No.: IBMK30230

to enter annotation content that is specific to the data object being annotated, which is not taught in *Gupta*.

Therefore, claims 1, 25, 28, 30 and their dependents are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 7, 27, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over US patent No 6,956,593 to *Gupta et al.* (hereinafter, "*Gupta*"), in view of Pub No. US 2002/0184401 to *Kadel Jr. et al.* (hereinafter, "*Kadel*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 28 and 29 have been canceled. Claims 5, 7, and 27 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 25 which Applicants submit are allowable for reasons discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

0 014/016

OCT 30 2006 PATENT
App. Ser. No.: 10/600,021
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920030230US1
PS Ref. No.: IBMK30230

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Gero McClellan, attorney of record, at (336) 643-3065, to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,


Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants

Page 13

611738_1.DOC